



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/945,258	08/31/2001	Peter H. St. George-Hyslop	1034/1H570US1 1969	
7:	590 09/20/2004		EXAMINER	
DARBY & DARBY P.C.			CARLSON, KAREN C	
805 Third Aver New York, NY			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1653	
			DATE MAILED: 09/20/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/945,258	ST. GEORGE-HYSLOP ET AL.			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Karen Cochrane Carlson, Ph.D.	1653			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 30 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.					
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:					
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.NOTE: .					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): obviousness-type -double patenting.					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).					
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.					
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>10,11 and 17-23</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-9 and 12-16.					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other:					

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, Applicants urge that any difference in PAMP activity identifies a candidate compound for treating neuropsychiatric or neurodevelopmental disorders. This statement is contrary to pharmacology principles, that is, if one factor is down regulated resulting in a disorder, then surely further down regulation or inhibition of this factor is not suitable for treatment of the disorder. And vice versa. Thus, this argument is not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the structure and the functional limitations of PAMP is provided in Claim 10 because % identity to SEQ ID NOs is used. This only satisfies the structural requirement, not the functional requirement, and therefore this argument is not persuasive. The claim does not set forth any function for PAMP variants and therefore the activity cannot be assessed.

Regarding the rejection under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph, again, Applicants discuss structure and not function of the PAMP variants. Therefore, as noted above, this argument is not persuasive..

KAREN COCHRANE CARLSON, PH.D PRIMARY EXAMINER

Kaver Cochane Carlow RV